



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,599	12/17/2003	Yumi Shibata	117961	5840
25944 7590 01/24/2007 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER LONG, ANDREA NATAE	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			01/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/736,599

Applicant(s)

SHIBATA ET AL.

Examiner

Andrea N. Long

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/17/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-15 have been examined in response to application filed 12/17/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claims 1-5 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Obradovich et al (PG Pub US 2002/0013815 A1), hereinafter "Obradovich".**

As to independent claim 1, Obradovich discloses an information display system (mobile device), comprising:

a display for displaying a facility information screen (page 1 paragraph [0009], page 2 [0039], Figure 9);

an information extractor for extracting position identification information from said facility information screen (page 2 paragraph [0037]);

a search unit for searching for a facility corresponding to said position identification information (page 2 paragraph [0037]);

a facility information registration unit for registering facility information including the position of the searched facility (page 2 paragraph [0039]; page 3 paragraph [0040]); and

a facility information storage unit for storing the registered facility information (page 2 paragraph [0037], page 3 paragraph [0040]).

As for dependent claim 2, Obradovich teaches an information terminal including said display and a transmitter/receiver unit (page 3 paragraph [0040];

and a server including said information extractor, said search unit, said facility information registration unit, said facility information storage unit, and a transmitter/receiver unit (page 2 paragraphs [0037] [0039]).

As for dependent claim 3, Obradovich teaches an information terminal including said display, said information extractor, said search unit, said facility information registration unit, and said facility information storage unit (page 2 paragraphs [0037] [0039], page 3 paragraph [0040]).

As for dependent claim 4, Obradovich teaches wherein said position identification information includes at least one of a telephone number and an address (page 3 paragraph [0040]), and said facility information registration unit verifies the consistency between the at least one of the telephone number and the address and

Art Unit: 2176

sets the position of the facility depending on the result of the verification of the consistency (page 3 paragraphs [0040] [0041]).

As for dependent claim 5, Obradovich teaches wherein the facility information includes a schedule in terms of a scheduled date/time (page 4 paragraph [0049], calendar).

As for dependent claim 9, Obradovich teaches wherein said position identification information includes at least one of a telephone number and an address (page 3 paragraph [0040]), and said facility information registration unit verifies the consistency between the at least one of the telephone number and the address and sets the position of the facility depending on the result of the verification of the consistency (page 3 paragraphs [0040] [0041]).

As for dependent claim 10, Obradovich teaches wherein said position identification information includes at least one of a telephone number and an address (page 3 paragraph [0040]), and said facility information registration unit verifies the consistency between the at least one of the telephone number and the address and sets the position of the facility depending on the result of the verification of the consistency (page 3 paragraphs [0040] [0041]).

As for dependent claim 11, Obradovich teaches wherein the facility information includes a schedule in terms of a scheduled date/time (page 4 paragraph [0049], calendar).

As for dependent claim 12, Obradovich teaches wherein the facility information includes a schedule in terms of a scheduled date/time (page 4 paragraph [0049], calendar).

As for dependent claim 13, Obradovich teaches wherein the facility information includes a schedule in terms of a scheduled date/time (page 4 paragraph [0049], calendar).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 6-8, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich et al (PG Pub US 2002/0013815 A1) in view of Tognazzini (US Patent 5790974), hereinafter "Tognazzini".**

As for dependent claim 6, Obradovich teaches a schedule (calendar).

However Obradovich does not teach giving an advance notification. Tognazzini teaches wherein a notification of the facility information is given in advance (column 1 lines 58-62, column 7 lines 3-9).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the calendar of Obradovich with the notification system of Tognazzini to inform the user of varying conditions affecting a user's schedule (column 1 lines 50-53).

As for dependent claim 7, Obradovich teaches a schedule. However Obradovich does not teach deleting a schedule when it expires. Tognazzini teaches wherein the schedule is deleted when the scheduled date/time expires (column 9 lines 9-21).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the calendar of Obradovich with the deleting of Tognazzini to allow a user to delete conflicting entries due to varying conditions which can affect a user's schedule (column 1 lines 50-53).

As for dependent claim 8, Obradovich teaches a schedule. However Obradovich does not teach updating a schedule. Tognazzini teaches wherein the schedule is updated when the scheduled date/time expires (column 1 lines 54-57).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the calendar of Obradovich with the updating of Tognazzini to allow a user to update conflicting entries due to varying conditions which can affect a user's schedule (column 1 lines 50-53).

As for dependent claim 14, Obradovich teaches a schedule. However Obradovich does not teach deleting a schedule when it expires. Tognazzini teaches wherein the schedule is deleted when the scheduled date/time expires (column 9 lines 9-21).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the calendar of Obradovich with the deleting of Tognazzini to allow a user to delete conflicting entries due to varying conditions which can affect a user's schedule (column 1 lines 50-53).

As for dependent claim 15, Obradovich teaches a schedule. However Obradovich does not teach updating a schedule. Tognazzini teaches wherein the schedule is updated when the scheduled date/time expires (column 1 lines 54-57).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the calendar of Obradovich with the updating of Tognazzini to allow a user to update conflicting entries due to varying conditions which can affect a user's schedule (column 1 lines 50-53).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record on Form PTO 892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea N. Long whose telephone number is 571-270-1055. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrea Long
01/19/2007

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER